**** CONFIDENTIAL PREDECISIONAL DOCUMENT ****

SUMMARY SCORESHEET FOR COMPUTING PROJECTED HRS SCORE

SITE NAME: Chemonics Laboratory Division McKenzie					
CITY, COUNTY: Phoenix, Maricopa					
EPA ID #: AZD057907883 EVALUAT	OR: Debi Mal	one			
PROGRAM ACCOUNT #: 0376 DA	TE: August 2	0, 1993			
Lat/Long: 33 27' 15"/ 112 04' 45" T/R	/s: (A 01-03) 09 CBB			
THIS SCORESHEET IS FOR A: PA S	si <u>X</u>	LSI			
SIRe PA Redo Other (Specify)					
RCRA STATUS (check all that apply):					
X GeneratorSmall Quantity Generator TSDF	Transpo	rter			
Not listed in RCRA Database as of (date	of printout)	07/1993			
STATE SUPERFUND STATUS:					
BEP (date) X	WQARF (da	te)			
No State Superfund Status (date)					
	S Pathway	S ² Pathway			
Groundwater Migration Pathway Score (S _{gw})	0.24	0.058			
Surface Water Migration Pathway Score (S.w)	*	*			
Soil Exposure Pathway Score (S.)	0.61	0.372			
Air Migration Pathway Score (S.)	3.21	10.30			
$S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_s^2 + S_s^2$					
		10.73			
$(S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_s^2 + S_s^2)/4$	xxxxxxxxx	2.683			
$\frac{1}{ (S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_s^2 + S_a^2)/4}$	xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx	1.640			
* Pathways not assigned a score (explain): *1 No surface water migration *					

GROUNDWATER MIGRATION PATHWAY SCCRESHEET

Factor Categories and Factors

		Maximum	Projected		Date
	Likelihood of Release	Value	Score	Rationale	Qual.
1.	Observed Release	550		1	H
2.	Potential to Release 2a. Containment	10	10	2	<u>H</u>
	2b. Net Precipitation 2c. Depth to Aquifer 2d. Travel Time 2e. Potential to Release	10 5 35	1 3 25	3 4 5	H H H
3.	[(Lines 2a x (2b+2c+2d)] Likelihood of Release (Higher	500			
•	of lines 1 or 2e)	550	290		
	Waste Characteristics				
5.	Toxicity/Mobility Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics (lines	a a	10	<u>6</u> 7	H D
0.	4 x 5, then use Table 2-7)	100	3	8	D
	Targets				
	Nearest Well Population	50	9	9	<u>H</u>
	8a. Level I Concentrations 8b. Level II Concentrations	b b	0 0	10	H H
	8c. Potential Contamination 8d. Population (lines 8a+8b+8	b c) b	8.8	12	E
	Resources	5	5	13	H
10.	Wellhead Protection Area Targets (lines 7+8+9+10)	20 b	22.8	14	<u>H</u>
	Likelihood of Release				
12.	Aquifer Score [(Lines 3 x 6 x 11)/82,500] ^c	100	0.24	4	- 1
Gro	undwater Migration Pathway Sco	re			
13.	Pathway Score (Sgw), (highest value from line 12 for all aquifers evaluated)	100	0.24		

a Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.
b Maximum value not applicable
c Do not round to the nearest integer.
d Use additional tables

Aquifer Evaluated All

GROUNDWATER PATHWAY CALCULATIONS

8. Population

Actual Contamination

Potential

Distance (Miles)	Total Number of Wells Within Distance Ring	Total Population Served by Wells Within Distance	Distance-Weighted Population Values "Other Than Karst" (Table 3-12) Ring (A)
0 to 1/4	0	0	0
>1/4 to 1/2	0	0	0
>1/2 to 1	1	87	17
>1 to 2	1	23	3
>2 to 3	2	570	68
>3 to 4	0	0	0
		Sum (A)	88
otential Contami	nation = Sum (A) =		

^{*} For drinking water wells that draw from a karst aquifer, see the Distance-Weighted Population Values for "Karst" in Table 3-12.

Aquifer Evaluated ALL

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories and Factors

/rhrs

-	0				
RESI	DENT POPULATION THREAT				
		Maximum	Projected		Data
	Likelihood of Exposure	Value	Score	Rationale	Qual:
1.	Likelihood of Exposure	550	550	1	E
	Waste Characteristics				
	*aste characteristics				
2.	Toxicity	а	10,000	2	H
3.	Hazardous Waste Quantity	a	10	3	H
4-	Waste Characteristics	100		4	E
	Targets				
5.	Resident Individual	50	0	5	11
6.	Resident Population				
	6a. Level I Concentrations	ь	0	4	H
	6b. Level II Concentrations	ь	0	6	H
	6c. Resident Population (lines 6a+6b)				
7.	Workers	b 15		-	
8.	Resources	5	3		7
9.	. Terrestrial Sensitive				
	Environments	С	0	9.	
10.	Targets (lines 5+6c+7+8+9)	b	5		A. A.A.
	Posidont Population Throat Sa				
	Resident Population Threat Sc	ore			
11.	Resident Population Score				
	(lines 1 x 4 x 10)	ь	49500	1	
			The state of the s		
NEARB	Y POPULATION THREAT				
	Libelihand of Donos				
	Likelihood of Exposure				
12.	Attractiveness/Accessibility	100	5	10	H
13.	Area of Contamination	100	20	11	+1
14.	Likelihood of Exposure	500	5	12	M
					100
	Waste Characteristics				
15	Taniai a				
15. 16.	Toxicity Hazardous Waste Quantity	a	10,000		
17.	Waste Characteristics	100	10		
	as to onaracteristics				
	Targets				
18.	Nearby Individual	1	1	12	11
19.	Population Within 1-Mile	b	12.2	14	Fin
20.	Targets (lines 18+19)	b	13.2		
	The state of the s				

24-Jan-1991

SOIL EXPOSURE CALCULATIONS

20.	Nearby	Population	Targets
-----	--------	------------	---------

	Sum (P)	122
>1/2 to 1	11,836	102
>1/4 to 1/2	993	1
0 to 1/4	992	0.13
Distance (miles)	Total Population Within Distance Ring	Population Values (Table 5-10)
		(P) Distance- Weighted

Nearby Population Threat factor value $\frac{\text{Sum (P)}}{10} = 12.2$

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEET (CONTINUED)

Factor Categories and Factors

	Nearby Population Threat Score	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale Qual.
21.	Nearby Population Threat (lines 14 x 17 x 20)	b	1188	

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE

22. Soil Exposure Pathway Score
(Ss), [lines (11+21)/82,500
subject to a maximum of 100] 100

b Maximum value not applicable.

d Do not round to the nearest integer.

a Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.

c No specific maximum value applies to this factor. However, pathway score based solely on sensitive environments is limited to a maximum of 60.

e Use additional tables.

AIR MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories and Factors

Ī	cikelihood of Release	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Qual.
1.	Observed Release Potential to Release	550			
	2a. Gas Potential	500	340	1	E
	2b. Particulate Potential 2c. Potential to Release (higher of lines 2a)	500	340		F
3.	and 2b) Likelihood of Release	500	_390_		
٠,٠	(higher of Lines 1 or 2c)	550	3.40	3_3_	E
	Waste Characteristics				
4.	Toxicity/Mobility	a	200	4	14
5.	Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics	а	10	5	H
	(lines 4 x 5, then use Table 2-7)	100			
	Targets				
7.	Nearest Individual Population	50	20	6	_+1_
	8a. Level I Concentrations		The Contract of the Contract o		+1
	8b. Level II Concentration		0	The such line	1-1
	8c. Potential Contaminatio 8d. Population (8a+8b+8c)	n b	93.2		E
9.	Resources	5	15.2	. 8	1
10.	Sensitive Environments ^e				
	10a. Actual Contamination	c	0	9	_+/_
	10b. Potential Contaminati 10c. Sensitive Environment				
	(lines 10a+10b)	C	0		#
11.	Targets (Lines 7+8d+9+10c)	ь	113.2		
Air Pa	athway Migration Score				
12.	Air Pathway Score (Sa) [(lines 3 x 6 x 11)/82,500]	100	3.21 d		

a Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.

b Maximum value not applicable.

d Do not round to nearest integer.

c No specific maximum value applies to factor. However, pathway score based solely on sensitive environments is limited to a maximum of 60.

e Use additional tables.

AIR PATHWAY CALCULATIONS

2. Potential to Release

Gas Potential to Release

	Source Type (Name)	Gas Containment Factor Value (Table 6-3)	Gas Source Type Factor Value (Table 6-4)	Gas Migration Potential Factor Value (Table 6-7)	Sum	Gas Source Value
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(B+C)	A x (B+C)
1.	cyanide	10	28	_6	34	340
2.						
3.						1000
4.				1		
				to Release Facto		

Particulate Potential to Release

Source Type (Name)	Particulate Containment Factor Value (Table 6-9)	Particulate Source Type Factor Value (Table 6-4)	Particulate Migration Potential Factor Value (Figure 6-2)	Sum	 Particulate Source Value
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(B+C)	A x (B+C)
1. lindane		22	17	39	390
2.					H)
3.					
4.					
	390				

AIR PATHWAY CALCULATIONS (CONTINUED)

8. Potential Contamination

Distance	Total Population	l Dist	(A) ance-Weighte	
(miles)	Within Distance Ring		Value (Tabl	
On site (0)	60		53	
>0 to 0.25	992		131	
>0.25 to 0.5	993		28	
>0.5 to 1	11836		261	
>1 to 2	3370f		266	
>2 to 3	30777		120	
>3 to 4	40,000		73	
	Sum of (A) =		932	
Air Potential Cont		Sum of (A) = 10	93.2	
. Actual Contan				
. Actual contain	(A)		1	
Wetland or	Sensitive	(B)	is it is	
Type of	Environment	Wetland		
Sensitive Environment	Rating Value (Table 4-23)	Rating Value (Table 6-18)		(A + B)
		AND DESCRIPTION		
		S. D. Land		
				The state of the s

AIR PATHWAY CALCULATIONS (CONTINUED)

Potential Contamination

Wetland or Type of Sensitive Environment	(A) Sensitive Environment Rating Value (Table 4-23)	(B) Wetland* Rating Value (Table 6-18)	Distance (miles)	(DW) Distance Weights (Table 6-15)	DW x (A + B)
	United the state of the state o	+ 3 h - 3 ga (3)	A CHILDRE		
			12459		
			THE STATE OF		
			Sum D	W x (A + B)	
Potential Con Sensitive Env		r Value = Sum D	W x (A + B	<u>)</u> =	

^{*} Only assign a Wetland Rating Value once for each wetland within a distance category.

/rhrs

RATIONALE FOR HRS FOR CHEMONICS LABORATORY DIVISION MCKENZIE Groundwater Pathway An observed release is not documented nor is one projected 1. due to no analytical data to concur with a release attributable to this site. The assigned value of 10 for Containment from HRS Table 3-2. 2. The assigned value for Net Precipitation is 1 from HRS 3. Figure 3-2. The depth to groundwater at the site is calculated from the bottom of the drywells (25 feet bgs) to the top of the aquifer at approximately 80 feet. The assigned value from HRS Table 3-5 is 3. The assigned hydraulic conductivity from HRS Table 3-6 is 5. 104 cm/sec. HRS Table 3-7 gives us a Travel Time of 25. The toxicity/mobility is assigned for Toxaphene; 6. (1,000) (0.01) gives us a value of 10. The Hazardous Waste Quantity defaults to 10. 7. The Waste Characteristics value from HRS Table 2-7 is 3. 8. The Nearest Well is between 1/2 and 1 mile from the site; 9. the assigned value from HRS Table 3-11 is 9. There are no Level I Concentrations. 10. There are no Level II Concentrations. 11. The Potential Contamination value from the worksheet is 8.8. 12. This varies greatly from the score calculated in the PA. The entire metropolitan population was used to attribute people to the counted wells. This rationale calculated the actual people per pumping well that is within the 4 mile radius of the site. The aquifer is used as a resource for irrigation; thus the 13. value assigned per HRS Section 3.3.3 is 5. There are no Wellhead Protection Areas in Region 9. 14. Therefore the value assigned is 0. This pathway does not score like it did in the PA due to inaccurate geographic and hydrologic data being used in the PA. The PA was also done when the old HRS Criteria was used; the new HRS doesn't allow the pathway to now score.

SOIL PATHWAY CHEMONICS 1. There is analytical soil data for chlorinated pesticide contamination at the site. The toxicity value is 10,000 for lindane, one of the 2. pesticides detected at the site. 3. The Hazardous Waste Quantity defaults to 10. 4. There is no Resident Individual as defined by HRS. 5. 6.

- Waste Characteristics assigned from HRS Table 2-7 is 18.
- There is no Resident Population affected by Level I or Level II contamination concentrations.
- There are approximately 60 persons working at the site; the 7. assigned value from HRS Table 5-4 is 5.
- 8. There is no affected Resources as identified by HRS Section 5.1.3.4.
- There are no Terrestrially Sensitive Environments. 9.
- The Attractiveness/Accessibility value assigned is 5 since 10. the site is fenced.
- The area of pesticide contamination is estimated to be 11. 75,000 square feet; so the assigned value from HRS Table 5-7 is 20.
- The Liklihood of Exposure value from HRS Table 5-8 is 5. 12.
- The Nearest Individual per HRS Table 5-9 is 0-1/4 mile so 13. the assigned value is 1.
- 14. The population within 1 mile using Target Population calculation makes the Threat Factor 12.2.

AIR PATHWAY

- Since solvents were used on site, the Gas Potential to 1. Release is calculated to give a value of 340.
- 2. Lindane was used to calculate Particulate Potential To Release; the value is 390.

CHEMONICS AIR PATHWAY CONTINUED 3. of 390. 4. value is then 200. 5.

- The Liklihood of Release is the Particulate Potential Value
- The Toxicity value for Lindane is 10,000. The mobility factor is 0.2 from Figure 6-3 of the HRS. The assigned
- The Hazardous Waste Quantity value defaults to 10.
- The nearest individual is approximately 1/8 mile; Table 6-16 6. gives the assigned value of 20.
- The population is calculated from Table 6-17 and the 7. assigned factor value is 93.2.
- 8. There are no Resources as defined by HRS.
- There are no sensitive environments as defined by HRS. 9.

Due to the pesticide contamination obviously present at this site and that this site will not score under current HRS criteria; this site would be an ideal candidate for the SACM Process.